

subject of jobs for the boys. The Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Mulroney) said, "Oh, there'll be jobs for Liberals and NDPers . . . but only after I've been Prime Minister for 15 years and can't find a single living, breathing Tory to appoint". Is that their reasoning? I would not suggest that it is, but perhaps it is the reason they have taken their position or non-position on this amendment as it relates to passing out grants and subsidies helter-skelter to either truckers or railways or anybody else they can find.

● (1650)

According to statements that Members of that Party have often made, that position is so untypical because the Tories are always knocking subsidies and grants. They want to let the market work. Now not only do they want or not want to provide subsidies for western grain, which have a very good historical reason which still continues, but they want to extend it to others and they go on and on. They want to give subsidies to anybody who seems to want them.

Conservative Members are now going to trust a bureaucrat to make the decision as to whether or not these subsidies are worthwhile. The Conservative Members who are knocking big Government and the bureaucrats are now going to trust a bureaucrat to make the decision as to whether something is a worthwhile objective or not without any other kind of supervision. They want to hand out subsidies and grants by the truckful to all the boys. I leave it to my colleagues on my right to decide whether or not that is relevant to their purpose in this debate or the larger debate on the Crow rate. Do they still even know what their position is?

Underlying the positions taken by the various Parties on this particular amendment and on the matter of the Crow as a whole is the basic nature and purpose of the various political Parties. Where do we get our support and campaign funds from? Looking back, Mr. Speaker, the official record of political contributions in Canada shows that in 1982, the Liberal Party received \$50,000 from Canadian Pacific Limited and the Conservative Party received \$50,000 from Canadian Pacific Limited. In the three previous years, 1981, 1980 and 1979, \$128,000 was given to the Liberals by CP Limited and 12 affiliates and \$134,000 was given to the Conservative Party by CP Limited and 12 affiliates. It is interesting to note that the figures for CP Limited alone indicate that its contribution to both Parties has doubled in the last year. Why is that?

I refer to another article which is related to this matter, "Unshackled from Crow, Profits Flow" by Barry Wilson published in the *Western Producer* at the end of September, 1983. That report shows very clearly that the profits for CP Limited have absolutely skyrocketed in the period of time since CP has begun to smell the gravy train coming. Is there perhaps a relationship between where political Parties get their money from and the positions they take and which corporations in our society profit from those positions? No one is suggesting that an individual politician is corrupt and no one is suggesting that a Party is corrupt, but perhaps a political and economic system that allows this sort of thing—

#### *Western Grain Transportation Act*

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Hon. Member for Crowfoot (Mr. Malone) rises on a point of order.

**Mr. Malone:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I had the intuition to ask you to remind the Hon. Member who is speaking what clause we are dealing with, but I have decided instead to ask you to remind him what Bill we are dealing with.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Chair has been listening closely to the Hon. Member and attempting to relate his remarks to the amendment before us. However, the Hon. Member for Kootenay West has the floor for another minute.

**Mr. Kristiansen:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that political donations can be traced through official Government records, we can see that there may indeed be a relationship between where political Parties get their financing and what position they take on issues in the House of Commons. That position can be measured against the profit performance of such companies as Canadian Pacific Limited and CP Transport at a time when we have amendments and resolutions before us such as we have today.

One has to wonder if in fact Members of the Conservative Party have a position on this question and whether or not they will make up their minds. We hope that they will. We hope that they will support this amendment and join the New Democratic Party in trying to get the best results for the people of Canada at the lowest possible cost. Let us not simply shovel out money by the truckload from the gravy train. That serves no useful purpose.

**Mr. Deputy Speaker:** The Chair hesitates to interrupt the Hon. Member but his allotted time has expired. He may continue with the unanimous consent of the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Some Hon. Members:** No.

**Mr. Jim Manly (Cowichan-Malahat-The Islands):** Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be afforded the opportunity to speak on Motion No. 35. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the various contributions that have been made to this motion as well as previous motions by Hon. Members of the NDP and very occasionally by Hon. Members of the Conservative Party and even more occasionally by Hon. Members of the Liberal Party.

When listening to Members of the Progressive Conservative Party, I have noticed that many of them have made a great deal out of the fact that some of us from the New Democratic Party who are speaking on this motion come from British Columbia or from Toronto or from other parts of the country other than from the Prairies. This is quite true. Our entire Party is involved in the struggle over the Crow rate. I suppose that prairie farmers would much sooner listen to someone from Vancouver Island defend their interests than put up with the rather horrifying silence from some of the Members of the